

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial No. 10/736,756

REMARKS

A total of 1 claim remains in the present application. The foregoing amendments are presented in response to the Office Action mailed November 16, 2005, wherefore reconsideration of this application is requested.

By way of the foregoing amendment, claim 11 has been amended to more distinctly define features of the present invention. The Abstract has been amended in response to the Examiner's objections. In preparing the foregoing amendments, careful attention has been paid to ensure that no new subject matter has been introduced.

Turning now to the text of the office Action:

- The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the claimed invention;
- The Abstract has been objected to for exceeding 150 words;
- Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for alleged lack of clarity; and
- Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over the teaching of United States Patent No. 6,690,864 (Dee et al.)

It is believed that the Examiner's various objections are fully addressed by way of the foregoing amendments, and further in view of the following comments.

Objections to the Drawings

It is believed that the Examiner's objections to the drawings have been traversed by way of the above-noted amendment to claim 11. In particular, the objected to limitation to the V-grooves of the fiber alignment system have been cancelled from this claim.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial No. 10/736,756

Objections to the Abstract

The Abstract has been amended to be less than 150 words in length, as required by the Examiner.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 11 has been amended to clearly define the relationships and interactions between each of the elements of the claimed device. Accordingly amended claim 11 is now believed to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

It is believed that amended claim 11 clearly defines over the teaching of United States Patent No. 6,690,864 (Dee et al.). For Example, Dee et al fail to teach the feature of "a high power external light source for curing a curable material disposed between the end of the waveguide and the light emitting source", as required by amended claim 11. Rather, Dee et al provides a signal source 84 which injects a light beam into the fiber pigtail 56 to provide a alignment signal to thereby enable proper alignment of the fiber with the package 60. "Following insertion and alignment, the fiber is soldered or otherwise bonded to the bench in the package 60" (Col 3, lines 60-61). However, Dee et al do not teach that the light source 84 is used for anything other than to provide an alignment signal. More particularly, Dee et al do not teach or suggest that the light source 84 is used in the step of "soldering or otherwise bonding" the fiber. As such Dee et al fail to teach or suggest any equivalent to the "high power external light source" required by amended claim 11.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the presently claimed invention is clearly distinguishable over the teaching of the cited reference. Accordingly, it is believed that the present application is now in good condition for allowance, and early action in that respect is courteously solicited.


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial No. 10/736,756

If any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this response, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-5113.

Respectfully submitted,
Armen ZOHRABYAN, et al

Date: March 16, 2006

Ogilvy Renault LLP
Suite 1500
1981 McGill College Avenue
Montreal, Quebec
Canada, H3A 2Y3
(613) 780-8673


By: Kent Daniels, P.Eng.
Reg. No. 44206
Attorney for the Applicants